



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/030,797 | 05/13/2002 | Scott Edward Klopfenstein | RCA89615 | 5617 |

7590 06/09/2010
Joseph S Tripoli
Thomson Multimedia Licensing
P O Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08540-5312

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

DANG, HUNG Q

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2621

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

06/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/030,797 | Applicant(s) KLOPFENSTEIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Hung Q. Dang | Art Unit 2621 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,9,11,12 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,9,11,12 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/31/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/13/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4, 6, and 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On page 10, Applicant argues that since Kondo discloses "replacing or updating the VCT, Kondo is clearly reacquiring a table as opposed to substituting a version number or reverting to a previous version." In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As quoted by Applicant in column 11, lines 3-8 of Kondo, Kondo discloses updating or replacing the table with the most updated table. First of all, it is noted that the updating or replacing of the table is equivalent to substitution of the table. Further, Kondo in column 4, discloses the tables to include the version number. Therefore, substitution of the table leads to substitution of the version number included therein.

Now the question is whether the claim language requires other data of the tables not to be substituted. The answer is, in contrast with Applicant's arguments, nowhere in

Art Unit: 2621

the claim language requires that other data of the table must be kept intact. At most, claim 1 of the current invention recites, " wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table." The Examiner respectfully submits that the feature underlined above is not the same as that of "requiring the table not to be substituted, or updated, or replaced."

As explained in the Office Action dated 03/24/2008, the Examiner respectfully submits that Kondo et al. also disclose the limitation of "wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table." For example, as disclosed by Kondo et al., the version number of the VCT in the MGT is used or, in other words, forced into that of the VCT in the system before the next piece of new information of either the VCT or MGT from broadcasting is available. In other words, it won't be updated or forced again until new information is acquired. This is so because the claim language does not specify which new information (corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table) it is regarding to. The Examiner respectfully submits that there are at least two kinds of new information are relevant in this context: (1) new information in the table that is about to replace the old table at current time and (2) new information in the table that is coming next to the table described in (1) above (see column 10, lines 1-12 for "information in the tables are provided continuously", which constitutes the ground for there existing new information described in (2) above). Both of these kinds of new information correspond to at least one of: said first table and said second table because

it contains updated information for said at least one of: said first table and said second table.

The Examiner respectfully submits that the claim language is too broad that it lets the new information described in (2) read on.

Besides that, there is not a single limitation reciting the feature of "requiring the table not to be substituted, or updated, or replaced" or "substituting the version numbers in the tables only."

Also, on page 10, Applicant argues that, "claim 1 specifically provides solutions to avoid reacquiring a table." The Examiner respectfully submits that this argument is irrelevant for the reason of the feature of "avoiding reacquiring a table" not being recited in the claim.

Also on page 11, according to his or her arguments described above, Applicant argues that Kondo does not teach, "wherein said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes at least one of the steps of: substituting a version number for said first table version number by substituting in said first table said first table number conveyed in said second table, to ensure compatibility, substituting said version number for said first table for said table version by substituting in said second table said first table number conveyed in said first table, to ensure compatibility, and reverting to a previous version of at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure version number compatibility." In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

For the reasons set forth above, Kondo does disclose the step of “substituting a version number for said first table version number by substituting in said first table said first table number conveyed in said second table, to ensure compatibility.” It does so by substituting the first table with the second table as explained above. Since the recited limitation only requires the step of ensuring compatibility to include one of the steps, and Kondo discloses the first step, Kondo discloses the whole limitation.

Also on page 11, Applicant argues that, “claim 1 highlights that the resolution of the mismatch occurs by forcing the compatibility of the version numbers without reacquiring data for a table.” In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reason as discussed above.

Also on page 11, Applicant argues that, “new information is obtained in Kondo in response to a mismatch prior to compatibility.” In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that the claim language does not specify which new information (corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table) it is regarding to. Also as described above, the Examiner respectfully submits that there are at least two kinds of new information are relevant in this context: (1) new information in the table that is about to replace the old table at current time and (2) new information in the table that is coming next to the table described in (1) above (see column 10, lines 1-12 for “information in the tables are provided continuously”, which constitutes the ground for there existing new information described in (2) above). Both of these kinds of new information correspond to at least one of: said first table and said second table because

it contains updated information for said at least one of: said first table and said second table.

On page 12, Applicant argues that Kondo does not disclose “ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch using a forced compatible version number, wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table.” In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. This argument has been addressed above thus is not repeated.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 and 11-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 12, regarding claim 9, Applicant argues that Kondo does not teach “disregarding said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch”. In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Kondo discloses disregarding the version number conveyed in said first table because the first table has been replaced with the second table (column 11, lines 2-10). Second, Kondo discloses disregarding the version number conveyed in said second table because, after replaced, it is the other information that is used during the decoding process and the version number is not used. The version number is only used for updating purposes (see column 8, lines 59-66; column 11, lines 2-10), not decoding purposes (column 4, lines 25-34).

REJECTION OF CLAIM 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 13, Applicant argues that “Augenbraun does not teach that the removal of the channel is associated with a fault condition.” In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that, in the Office Action dated 03/24/2008, Augenbraun is relied upon to disclose “removing a channel from a User’s viewable active channel line-up list” to be combined with Kondo's teachings of detecting a channel being associated with a fault condition (Kondo, column 9, lines 25-31).

The cited passage from Augenbraun, as quoted by Applicant on page 14, states that, “... it is also possible to customize the channel guide in that the channels that the user rarely access can be removed upon the initial display ...”

A channel with a fault condition obviously falls into the category of “rarely access” because it has errors. Actually, it cannot be accessed. If it cannot be accessed, Augenbraun teaches that the user removes it from being displayed (it is emphasized that the claim language does not recite “automatic removal”). The removal is desirable in for the sake of a nice user interface. Therefore, the motivation to incorporate the teachings of Augenbraun into Kondo is well obvious.

REJECTIONS OF OTHER CLAIMS

Since Applicant does not point out any specific limitations in any other claims, the rejections of which he or she disagrees with the Examiner, but at most, Applicant only relies on arguments with respect to the independent claims, the discussions of which have been set forth above, the Examiner will not address these claims under the assumption that if Applicant's arguments regarding the base claims have been proven not persuasive, the rejections of other claims do have well-founded grounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11-12, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. .

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11-12, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation. Thus, the claims are non-statutory.

The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101.

Note the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion Ex parte Langemyer et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522).

Regarding claim 1, Kondo et al. disclose a method in a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), comprising the steps of: detecting a mismatch between a version number of a first table of said program specific information and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table (column 10, lines 1-12; column 4, lines 6-17); ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch using a forced

Art Unit: 2621

compatible version number, wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table (column 8, lines 59-66; column 9, lines 6-9, 25-28; column 11, lines 2-50; also see "Response to Arguments" above); and decoding packetized program information using program specific information including said first and second tables, at least one of said first and second tables including said forced compatible version number to provide a video program for display (column 4, lines 25-33; column 2, lines 41-44); wherein said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes at least one of the steps of: substituting a version number for said first table version number by substituting in said first table said first table number conveyed in said second table, to ensure compatibility, substituting said version number for said first table for said table version by substituting in said second table said first table number conveyed in said first table, to ensure compatibility, and reverting to a previous version of at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure version number compatibility (column 10, lines 6-8; see "Response to Arguments" above).

Regarding claim 4, Kondo et al. also disclose said second table conveys a plurality of version numbers corresponding to version numbers conveyed in said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables (TABLE 1 in column 9), and said detecting step includes the step of comparing individual version numbers of said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables against corresponding individual

version numbers conveyed in said second table (column 10, line 63 – column 11, line 53).

Regarding claim 6, Kondo et al. also disclose said substituting step comprises overwriting said first table version number conveyed in at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure compatibility (column 10, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 8, Kondo et al. also disclose said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes the step of acquiring at least one of (a) a new version of said first table, and (b) a new version of said second table, to ensure version number compatibility after said forcing operation is performed (column 11, lines 2-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) as applied to claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 above, and further in view of Ozkan et al. (WO 99/03268).

Regarding claim 2, Kondo et al. disclose second table contains information for acquiring program specific information conveyed in other tables including identifiers for identifying data packets comprising said first table (TABLE 1 in column 9). Kondo et al. also disclose first table comprises a channel map, which contains a list of all of the

channels with their attributes (column 9, lines 1-6). However, Kondo et al. do not disclose the channel map to associate a transmission channel carrier frequency with data identifiers used to capture data streams constituting a program conveyed on a broadcast channel.

Ozkan et al. disclose a channel map to associate a transmission channel carrier frequency with data identifiers used to capture data streams constituting a program conveyed on a broadcast channel (abstract).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the channel map taught by Ozkan et al. into the channel map taught by Kondo et al. because of simple implementation.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) as applied to claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 above, and further in view of Blatter et al. (US Patent 5,844,595).

Regarding claim 3, see the teachings of Kondo et al. as discussed in claim 1 above. However, Kondo et al. do not disclose examining said program specific information for error indications by examining at least one of (a) an MPEG transport error indicator, (b) an MPEG discontinuity indicator, (c) an MPEG continuity counter, and decoding said packetized program information in response to said examination determination of an error free condition.

Blatter et al. disclose examining program specific information for error indications (abstract) by examining at least one of (a) an MPEG transport error indicator, (b) an MPEG discontinuity indicator, (c) an MPEG continuity counter (column 12, lines 16-22;

column 15, lines 44-67), and decoding packetized program information in response to said examination determination of an error free condition (abstract).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the concept of examining the program specific information for errors and decoding the packetized program information in response to a determination of an error free condition taught by Blatter et al. into the method taught by Kondo et al. for ensuring data reliability.

Claims 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) and Blatter et al. (US Patent 5,844,595).

Regarding claim 9, Kondo et al. disclose a method in a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), comprising the steps of: detecting a mismatch between a version number of a first table of said program specific information and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table (column 10, lines 1-12; column 4, lines 6-17); decoding packetized program information (column 4, lines 25-33; column 2, lines 41-44) by disregarding said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch and by applying program specific information including information in said first table (column 11, lines 2-10).

However, Kondo et al. do not disclose examining said program specific information for an error condition and decoding said packetized program information in response to the absence of an error condition.

Blatter et al. disclose examining said program specific information for an error condition (abstract) and decoding said packetized program information in response to the absence of an error condition (abstract; also see "Response to Arguments" above).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the concept of examining the program specific information for error condition and decoding the packetized program information in response to the absence of an error condition taught by Blatter et al. into the method taught by Kondo et al. for ensuring data reliability.

Regarding claim 11, see the teachings of Kondo et al. and Blatter et al. as discussed in claim 10 above. Furthermore, Blatter et al. also disclose said error condition is indicated by at least one of (a) an MPEG transport error indicator, (b) an MPEG discontinuity indicator, (c) an MPEG continuity counter (column 12, lines 16-22; column 15, lines 44-67).

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4 above with reference to claim 9 above.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) and Augenbraun et al. (US Patent 5,617,565).

Regarding claim 19, Kondo et al. disclose a method in a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information

Art Unit: 2621

comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3), comprising the steps of: detecting a fault condition in program specific information comprising at least one of (a) a version number incompatibility between a version number of a first table and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table, and (b) a PSI error condition (column 10, lines 1-12; column 4, lines 6-17); indicating in a database said transmission channel is associated with said detected fault condition (column 9, lines 25-31). Also, Kondo et al. also disclose the information associated with the fault detection is flagged invalid and not displayed (column 9, lines 25-31). However, Kondo et al. do not disclose removing a channel associated with said fault condition from a User's viewable active channel line-up list.

Augenbraun et al. disclose removing a channel from a User's viewable active channel line-up list (column 5, lines 13-17).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the step of removing a channel from the line-up list taught by Augenbraun et al. into the method taught by Kondo et al. because such doing would make the method user-friendlier.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) and Augenbraun et al. (US Patent 5,617,565) as

applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Blatter et al. (US Patent 5,844,595).

Regarding claim 20, see the teachings of Kondo et al. and Augenbraun et al. as discussed in claim 19 above. However, the proposed combination of Kondo et al. and Augenbraun et al. does not disclose detecting a PSI error condition comprising at least one of (a) an MPEG transport error, (b) an MPEG discontinuity error, (c) an MPEG continuity count error, and (d) an error indicated by a variance between successive time stamps.

Blatter et al. disclose detecting a PSI error condition (abstract) comprising at least one of (a) an MPEG transport error, (b) an MPEG discontinuity error, (c) an MPEG continuity count error, and (d) an error indicated by a variance between successive time stamps (column 12, lines 16-22; column 15, lines 44-67).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the step of detecting PSI error condition taught by Blatter et al. into the method taught by Kondo et al. and Augenbraun et al. for data reliability.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (US Patent 6,763,522) and Augenbraun et al. (US Patent 5,617,565) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Fujimori et al. (US Patent 6,445,923).

Regarding claim 21, see the teachings of Kondo et al. and Augenbraun et al. as discussed in claim 19 above. However, the proposed combination of Kondo et al. and

Augenbraun et al. does not disclose indicating a channel as being associated with a fault condition in a user's viewable channel line-up list.

Fujimori et al. disclose indicating a channel as being associated with a fault condition in a user's viewable display (column 2, lines 1-8).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the step of indicating a channel as being associated with a fault condition in a user's viewable display taught by Fujimori et al. into the method taught by Kondo et al. and Augenbraun et al. because doing such would make the method user-friendlier.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Q. Dang whose telephone number is (571)270-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on IFT.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI Q. TRAN can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung Q Dang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621